



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/233,475 | 01/20/1999 | KUNIHIKO WAKABAYASHI | 017344-0290 | 7383 |

7590 08/22/2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
WASHINGTON HARBOR
3000 K STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON, DC 200078696

EXAMINER

CHOW, MING

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2645

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/233,475 | WAKABAYASHI, KUNIHIKO | |
| | Examiner Ming Chow | Art Unit 2645 | (10) |
| -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -- | | | |
| Period for Reply | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 August 2003</u> . | | | |
| 2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final. | | | |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1,2,11,12 and 17-24</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | |
| 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1,2,11,12 and 17-24</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| 10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | |
| 11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | |
| 12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | |
| 13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | |
| 14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. | | | |
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . | |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . | |

This is an after-final re-prosecution.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 17-24 recite the limitation "voice response message" on lines 17, 18, 23, 24 in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 1 cites "voice reply message" on line 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al (US: 6052442), and in view of Inoue (JP 405227274A) and Brown et al (US: 4972461).

For claims 1, 2, 11 and 12, regarding “a memory.....from a sender”, Cooper et al teach on column 4 line 39 “incoming voice messages are digitized by A/D converter and stored in memory”.

Cooper et al failed to teach “the memory further.....the voice mail”. However, Inoue teaches on Abstract – an answering machine with a storage means (claimed “memory”) for recording both incoming and reply messages.

Regarding an identifier to identify a sender number attached to the voice mail that contains the digitized voice, the sender number corresponding to the sender that has sent the digitized voice, Cooper et al teach on column 2 line 59 “when the answering machine answers a call, before playing an outgoing message, it may read the telephone number of the calling party using the Calling Number Delivery (CND) service”. It is inherent that there must be an identifier of Cooper’s system to identify the sender number.

Regarding “an e-mail transmitter.....to the sender”, Cooper et al teach on column 7 line 47-51 a processor (claimed “e-mail transmitter”) packages the reply into the email format and transmits it to the sender of the original message.

Regarding a table that provides a correspondence between a plurality of e-mail addresses and a plurality of sender numbers, respectively; and a control unit.....apparatus, wherein the table is accessed to allow a recipient of the digitized voice to send an e-mail response to the corresponding e-mail address of the sender, Cooper et al teach on item 10 Fig. 1 “processor” (claimed “control unit”). Cooper et al teach on column 9 line 40 “memory may include a pre-stored correspondence or ‘telephone directory’ between telephone numbers and.....other identifying information.....the user may also choose to automatically store email addresses of

some or all senders into the telephone directory". The "telephone directory" of Cooper et al is the claimed "table". The "between telephone numbers and.....other identifying information.....the user may also choose to automatically store email addresses of some or all senders" reads on the claimed "correspondence between a plurality of e-mail addresses and a plurality of sender numbers". Cooper et al also teach on column 11 line 26 "the user may select the destination address by using keypad to choose an entry in the telephone directory stored in memory". The "using keypad to choose an entry in the telephone directory" of Cooper et al is the claimed "the table is accessed to allow a recipient....". Cooper et al also teach on column 7 line 44 "the user may compose text for the reply using keypad". The "text for the reply" of Cooper et al reads on the claimed "send an e-mail response".

Cooper et al failed to teach "the digitized voice.....by the identifier". However, Brown et al teach on column 5 line 13-14 recording digitized voice messages. Brown et al also teach on column 16 line 33-34 recording caller's voice message at a memory location identifiable using said caller's billing code (claimed "based on the identification of the sender number").

Regarding "the control unit obtains.....to the sender", Cooper et al teach on column 7 line 47-51 a processor (claimed "control unit") packages the reply into the email format and transmits it to the sender of the original message.

Regarding "the e-mail.....response message", "Official Notice" is taken that opening an email and reviewing its attached voice response is old and well known to one skilled in the art. Also, although, Cooper et al did not teach how the original message sender opens an email and reviews its voice response attachment but Cooper et al did teach how the original message recipient opens an email and reviews its voice attachment (see column 2 line 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Cooper et al to have the “the memory further.....the voice mail” and “the e-mail.....response message” as taught by Inoue, “the digitized voice.....by the identifier” as taught by Brown et al such that the modified system of Cooper et al would be able to support the memory, and opening the mail with an voice response attachment, and the memory address to the system users.

3. Claims 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al and Inoue, Brown et al as stated in claim 1 above, and in view of Goldberg et al (US: 6304636).

Regarding claims 17, 19, 21, 23, Cooper et al and Inoue failed to teach “the at least.....to the sender”. However, Goldberg et al teach on column 3 line 26-28 the voice message is converted to be digitized text and included within the e-mail. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Cooper et al and Inoue to have the “the at least.....to the sender” as taught by Goldberg et al such that the modified system of Cooper et al and Inoue would be able to support the converting voice messages to be text to the system users.

Regarding claims 18, 20, 22, 24, Cooper et al and Inoue failed to teach “the sender.....a text file”. However, Goldberg et al teach on column 3 line 32-34 the voice message within the email can be either listened to if it’s an audio file or can be read if it’s in a text format. It would have been obvious to one skilled at the time the invention was made to modify Cooper et al and Inoue to have the “the sender.....a text file” as taught by Goldberg et al such that the modified system of Cooper et al and Inoue would be able to support the listening or reading the audio message to the system users.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/4/03 have been fully considered.
 - i) Applicant argues, on page 8-9, regarding the claimed limitation "a particular memory address.....by the identifier". A new prior art (Brown et al) is referenced as stated above for the rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not replied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Picard et al (US-PAT-NO: 6,233,318) teach system for accessing multimedia mailboxes and messages over the internet and via telephone.

6. Any inquiry concerning this application and office action should be directed to the examiner Ming Chow whose telephone number is (703) 305-4817. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang, can be reached on (703)

Application/Control Number: 09/233,475
Art Unit: 2645

Page 7

305-4895. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to TC2600's Customer Service FAX Number 703-872-9314.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2645

Ming Chow



FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

